


PLAN OF FANGFOSS CHURCH AS OPENED OCTOBER, 1848.



### THE DISCOVERY AT FANGFOSS CHURCH, YORKSHIRE.

On taking down the dilapidated Norman Church of Fangfoss (about four miles from Pocklington, in Yorkshire), the plan of the ancient church has been made clear, and many fragments have been discovered, belonging not only to the lately-existing building, but to the more ancient structure. The east and west end walls and small tower had been rebuilt within the last half century; and in those walls many of the arch stones, corbels, and fragments of ancient crosses had been walled in with other old stones, mixed with brick, and a brick porch had been added. With the exception of the porch and two modern square windows, the south side retained its original form, and the north wall of the chancel also, to a height of 10 feet: the north wall of the nave had been almost wholly rebuilt; the chancel pillars had been covered over with wood scantlings, concealed by lath and plaster, and the arch over them also by a flat ceiling; and round the nave was a very elaborate dentilled and modillioned cornice, which, by excluding the air from the oak roof, had caused a premature decay. We are indebted to Mr. R. D. Chantrell, the architect, for the following particulars.

During the last fortnight in September the old building was removed, and trenches ordered to be made for extending the walls, both eastward and westward; and on the 21st the return of the chancel plinth, at G and H, on the annexed plan, appeared: also about 8 feet of plinth to the west. On the 22nd and 23rd Mr. Chantrell traced the rubble foundation of an apse at the east end (coloured light on the plan), also the plinths of three buttresses, nearly equidistant from each other on the north side.

All the stone found is the oolite, which is obtained a few miles north of the village, and contains fossil shells, which are observable in that of many churches on the Yorkshire wolds. The dressing is cross drafting, and the stones are nearly square. The rubble foundation was composed of large and small stones, well mixed with sand and gravel (which runs immediately beneath the soil), and taken from the vicinity: this rubble, or concrete, was bedded regularly upon the stratum of gravel, wherever the excavation has been made contiguous to it.

Beside the three sets of arch stones of the entrance to the chancel, ten others have been found within the ashlar, firmly embedded in the bonding: under what has been the tower staircase, two fragments of pillar shafts, one 7 the other 8 inches long, were placed vertically. The bed of the tower plinth was 1 inch below that of the body, which may be attributed to the greater weight of the tower, as in other respects the plinths correspond. The arch stones under the east end of the chancel had two courses of herring-bone work beneath them. The bed stones of the ancient portal having been exposed, shew that the entrance door has had three pillars on each side, giving five sets of arch stones.

The interior shews that at some period the building had been destroyed by fire, the face of the whole inside, the pillars and arches entering the chancel indicating intense heat, and

the chancel arch stones are so greatly injured thereby as to be unfit for rebuilding. At the west end, on the general level of the floor, the ashlar stone internally was burnt, and also the flag-stone floor (indicated by the same red colour as the rest), and a black line, varying from half an inch to an inch and half, with small fragments of charcoal, prove the fact: this must have taken place since the erection of the latter church, as the older arch stones are not discoloured like those of the chancel arch. The walls had been whitewashed, and no indication of fire appeared before the building was taken down. Some fragments of stone which could not have been reached by the fire, were burnt, and became the same colour, to prove that nothing but intense heat could have so discoloured and shattered the surface of the internal stonework. (On some of the stones which had been coloured, are 2-inch letters, of scriptural sentences, not earlier than the end of the sixteenth century. Some peculiar ancient crosses were used as fillings-in in the walls; some were covers of graves, and others erect, being carved on two sides. The corbel table on the south side was of coupled arches rudely cut, the corbels of the general Norman character: on one is the warrior on horseback, with a spear and the nasal helmet (used, according to Merrick, by the Danes, and till the end of Stephen's reign); on another, a large horse's head, and a soldier with nasal helmet on each side holding by a bridle across the nose. The corbel table on the north was in the form of a rude M, and this corresponding with the Norman M, may have alluded to the saint's name to whom the church was, probably, dedicated; as, if orientation is to be depended on, Saint Martin's day is thereby indicated.

It is greatly to be regretted that there are no hopes of raising more than 600*l.* for the rebuilding of this church, which, if restored, would cost double that sum. Could adequate funds be obtained, there are sufficient data for a restoration, and a beautiful and interesting specimen of early work might be rescued from oblivion.

The plan shews the foundation of tower since excavated. The part tinted dark is the outline of building recently taken down. The centre line of chancel inclines 3 inches to the north. A, B, C, show stone coffins, which were found last week: the two latter are very small. Each contained the bones of an infant. The stones are rude blocks. D shews rough base of font (in one stone), 3 feet 3 inches diameter, and 3 feet 6 inches high—15 inches above old floor.

**APPOINTMENT BY THE GENERAL BOARD OF HEALTH.**—We understand that Messrs. George Thomas Clark, Edward Cressy, Robert Rawlinson, and William Manger, all professedly civil engineers, have been appointed the first superintending inspectors under the new Act. A dead set appears to be made by the leading parties in the health movement against architects, simply because they are architects, and without any regard to individual fitness,—concerning which we may have something to say before long.

### WHAT IS MEANT BY THE "GROUND-FLOOR" OF A BUILDING?

SIR,—It seems to be the fashion nowadays for every Act-of-Parliament-monger to use terms, and particularly trade and otherwise technical terms, in senses different from those in which the last before him had explained, or employed without explaining, the same terms. The common use in London of the word floor, applied to dwelling-houses, is in the sense of story, in the same way that a labouring man is called a *hand*, or such men, collectively employed upon any work, *hands*; but it would not do, I suppose, to describe the crew of a ship or the men employed in building a ship or a house in an Act of Parliament, or other document requiring definite language, as *hands*! The Metropolitan Buildings Act declares, in somewhat clumsy language, certainly, but definite nevertheless, and consistent with technical propriety, that the word floor, as employed in that Act is intended to mean "the horizontal platform forming the base of any story," and that the word story "is to be taken to include the full thickness of such floor as well as the space between the upper surface of one floor and the under surface of the floor next above it."

Now come the New Sewers' Acts with their "funnyologies."

The Act for all the metropolis but the City—all the man but his stomach! or all the ship but her hold!—says, in section 46, that a house that has been pulled down to or below the floor, commonly called the ground-floor, is not to be rebuilt, unless the lowest floor be made low enough to admit of being drained; and the City Sewers Act (11 and 12 Vict., c. 163) says, in section 64, with reference to the same point, that whenever a house shall be taken down within twelve feet of the surface of the ground—[Does this mean of the ground the house stands upon, or of the ground, paved way, or what-not, nearest to the level of its principal entrance?—for the purpose of being rebuilt, such building up shall be deemed a rebuilding, and the level of the lowest floor is to be raised to allow of its being drained, &c.—and this whether it wants raising for that purpose or not!]

If these two Acts intend the same thing, upon the same point, it is clear that floor, as used in the first place, in the former, is to be understood in the vulgar sense of story, and different from that in which the Metropolitan Buildings Act requires it to be applied, though it is tolerably certain that both of the Sewers Acts, in speaking of the level of the lowest floor, mean the floor, and not the story!

The parentage of the Metropolitan Sewers Act and of the Public Health Act is understood to be the same; but even these twin sisters differ in the terms employed to express the same thing, or what we may suppose to be the same, so much as to admit of doubt, whether they do embody the same intention. The Metropolitan Sewers Act, says, with reference to the pulling down of houses to be rebuilt, as before quoted, "to or below the floor commonly called the ground-floor," whilst the Public Health Act says in section 49 as to the same subject, "to or below the level of the